

23 June 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: D/DCI/NI

SUBJECT : Issues Still at Dispute Concerning the Estimates
Advisory Panel

1. The principal issue is the amount of publicity to be accorded the composition of the Panel. [] would change the language of our draft consensus paper to read that the Panel's membership would be announced; [] would add that Panel members should expect that their membership would become public. [] at the other pole, would pledge the Agency to do its best to keep private the membership of those who wished it that way. []'s reasoning is attached in full.

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

2. A lesser issue is the extent to which Panel members' critiques of papers are delivered individually or collegially. [] as I get it, would have any references to sub-panels deleted to avoid any suggestion of collegiality; his remarks are attached in full.

25X1

3. Minor word changes involving no basic issues are indicated on the attached draft of the original consensus paper.

[]
Executive Officer
National Intelligence

25X1

Attachments

D/DCI/NI [] 1m (23 June 76)

25X1

Distribution:

Orig - Addressee

① - IAP File

1 - EO Chrono

MORI/CDF

Administrative - Internal Use Only

23 June 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: D/DCI/NI

SUBJECT : Comments on 15 June Memorandum
re Advisory Panel

1. My previous note on this subject was on 11 June and was keyed to your 10 June memo.
2. The 15 June draft accommodates virtually all the suggestions on which I felt at all strongly, and I have only one problem left -- concerning public acknowledgment (paragraph h, page 3).
3. Can we really promise no effort to keep membership secret? For many years, panels of consultants were assured of privacy and the assurance was successfully honored. I know times (and the Agency's PR needs) have changed, but surely not so much that we can no longer enter into selective private relationships with individuals at mutual consent. The [redacted] memo on academic relationships certainly allows for doing so. 25X1
4. Moreover, important as it will be to let the public know of the fact of this panel (and some willing and impressive names on it), to contemplate full public acknowledgment of all members would deter a number of good people from joining and encourage a number of less desirable types -- the super-partiots, etc.
5. And a fully public panel could soon take on some attributes of a "Board of Visitors" -- feeling they were possessed of both authority and responsibility for CIA judgments. This could quickly lend itself to press exploitation and other hot potatoes. For example, on controversial issues, known members of a panel may be hounded by press or Congressmen (or Congressional staffers) on their views, their role, whether they were invited to participate and if not, why not, etc.
6. Perhaps these are unwarranted fears, but I think them sufficiently real (and I'm even more sure that some potential consultants would) to reiterate my previous suggestion that the principle with respect to acknowledgment should be: to let all know that the existence of the panel would be public knowledge, that some members should be chosen who are willing to be acknowledged, for illustrative purposes, and that the Agency do its best to assure the remainder of privacy if they want it. 25X1

[redacted]
NIO/WE

Administrative - Internal Use Only